DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 651 UD 012 828

TITLE	Neighborhood Facilities: A Study of Operating Facilities. Community Development Evaluation Series, Number 1.
INSTITUTION	Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 71
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *Community Development; Community Services; *Community Surveys; Data Analysis; *Neighborhood Centers; Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; *Public Facilities; Questionnaires; Resource Allocations; Seminars; Site Analysis; Staff Utilization
IDENTIFIERS	Neighborhood Facilities Program

ABSTRACT

This report, the first of a series attempting to provide information on community development programs, Federal processes, and policies, presents an evaluation of the operating centers constructed with Housing and Urban Development Neighborhood Facilities grants. The program evaluated provides grants to help local public bodies finance development of neighborhood centers to serve low- and moderate-income communities--tc provide a wide range of services and activities including health, educational, social, and recreational programs; the grants may be used to help finance up to two-thirds the cost of a new building or to rehabilitate an existing structure. The evaluation comprised three phases: survey of operating facilities, site visits, and seminars. As a result of the survey, 22 findings suggesting policy clarifications, procedural modifications, guidance, and management actions emerged. Fourteen recommendations in these areas were made in addition to other immediate recommendations related to the study which were implemented. Action taken as a result of the evaluation is discussed. Appended are the sample blanks of the questionnaires used in the survey, a field guide for regional and area office staff, and data tables summarizing the results of survey of the 145 operating facilities. (RJ)

ED 065651

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION SERIES No.1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Neighborhood Facilities A Study of Operating Facilities

UD 012828

DECEMBER, 1971

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Preface

This report is the first in a series of Community Development publications released by the HUD Office of Community Development, Evaluation Division. Evaluation studies conducted by the Division of Evaluation and by contractors to the Division are part of an effort to provide information on Community Development programs, Federal processes, and policies.

Neighborhood Facilities presents an evaluation of operating centers constructed with HUD Neighborhood Facilities grants. In July, 1971, the Division of Evaluation began evaluating existing Neighborhood Facilities to improve the program's effectiveness and management. Staff from all divisions of the Office of Community Development participated in the study advising on survey content and analysis, serving on site-visit teams, and taking part in seminars to translate interim study recommendations into action.

The report describes the major findings and recommendations of this evaluative effort.

Contents

	PREFACE	i
1.	BACKGROUND	1
2.	METHODOLOGY	3
3.	FINDINGS	13
	FACILITY SERVICES	13
	FACILITY OPERATIONS	20
	FACILITY STAFFING	24
	HUD PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	27
4.	RECOMMENDATIONS	37
5.	ACTION TAKEN	39
	APPENDIXES:	43
A.	NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES PROGRAM SURVEY	45
B.	NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES FIELD GUIDES	55
C.	TABLES WHICH SUMMARIZE SURVEY DATA	59

1. Background

The Neighborhood Facilities Program, authorized by Section 703 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, is administered by the Assistant Secretary for Community Development, U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

HUD's Neighborhood Facilities Program provides grants to help local public bodies finance development of neighborhood centers to serve low- and moderate-income communities. These centers bring to neighborhood residents a wide range of services and activities, including health, educational, social, and recreational programs. The grants may be used to help finance up to two-thirds the cost of a new building or to rehabilitate an existing structure. In the U. S. Department of Commerce designated Redevelopment Areas, a grant may be increased to three-fourths of the cost of the project. The Federal grant may fund architectural services, land acquisition, demolishing unneeded buildings, site improvements, and construction of the neighborhood center. Grants may not be used to cover the costs of operating the center.

In February 1971, the General Accounting Office wrote to HUD expressing concern about the Neighborhood Facilities program. GAO had surveyed three operating centers and concluded "In each case the grantee provided only a token social service program. Furthermore, we believe that there was adequate evidence available to indicate, prior to commitment of grant funds, that the three grantees would not be able and/or willing to provide a viable multipurpose program." GAO indicated that HUD needed (1) a more effective review of grant applications to identify those projects having a minimal potential for meeting the goals of the program, and (2) increased efforts to improve the performance of grantees who are not providing a multipurpose program.

Assistant Secretary for Community Development, Floyd H. Hyde, responded to GAO's report in April, 1971 and noted that: (1) a refined project selection system is being developed, (2) increased coordination is being made with other Department programs, such as Model Cities, (3) techniques are being developed to provide greater assurance that local service agencies understand and honor their commitments to provide services.

HUD field staff were advised to begin visits to operating centers to determine compliance with grant agreements and regulations. Three of the Regional Offices began to visit facilities in order to identify deficiencies and help communities to improve the level of facility operations.

To complement the Regional and Area Office review of Neighborhood Facilities, Assistant Secretary Hyde requested a Washington Central Office study of the program. The office of Community Development's Evaluation Division began the study in July, 1971 to (1) assess the effectiveness of the program, (2) evaluate the impact of HUD policies, and (3) determine what services are provided to what consumers.

The methodology used for this national study of the Neighborhood Facilities Program is described in Chapter 2. The remainder of this report presents:

- findings related to area and regional office management, facility operations, facility services, facility history, and administrative services;
- recommendations related to policy, procedures, guidance, and HUD management of the program;
- actions taken as a result of this evaluation; and
- an appendix of statistical tables, the survey questionnaires, and field guides for site visits.

2. Methodology

The Neighborhood Facilities evaluation has three phases:

- Phase I - Survey of Operating Facilities,
- Phase II - Site Visits, and
- Phase III - Seminars.

Survey of Operating Facilities

Quantitative data was obtained on the staffing and services of 182 centers, identified by the HUD/CD Division of Automated Data Processing and Program Statistics as operating on February 28, 1971. The aim was to survey those facilities "geared up" with staff and services, rather than those in construction or in early phases of operation. Nine facilities were added to the universe by HUD Regional and Area Offices. The total number of facilities contacted became 190. The questionnaire was mailed on August 6, 1971 to 190 local HUD neighborhood facility grant recipients. However, the San Francisco Area Office staff directly administered questionnaires on site to facilities personnel within their geographic area. The questionnaire, which can be found in Appendix A of this report, requests information on:

- Facility Administration,
- Proposed Services,
- Provided Services, and
- Facility Staffing.

A total of 158 facilities completed the questionnaire. Thirteen of the 158 had not begun operations as of June 30, 1971. Thus, although 83% of the facilities responded, the analysis represents data on 145 facilities or 76% of the total operating facilities.

Responses by Region

The Southeast and Southwest have the largest number of facilities in operation with the HUD Atlanta Region taking the lead with 43 operating facilities and Fort Worth and San Francisco carrying 39 and 32 operating facilities respectively. Distribution of response is uneven by region; regions with a high number of facilities placed on Indian reservations and in Spanish-speaking communities have lower response rates. The table below shows the response by region.

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES BY REGION

Region		Total No. of Facilities Contacted	Total No. of Responses	% of Response
I	Boston	6	4	67%
II	New York	9	5	55%
III	Philadelphia	10	8	80%
IV	Atlanta	43	32	74%
V	Chicago	19	17	90%
VI	Fort Worth	39	34	87%
VII	Kansas City	17	17	100%
VIII	Denver	12	6	50%
IX	San Francisco	32	20	62%
X	Seattle	3	2	67%
	TOTAL	190	145	76%

Responses by Community Population

Of the total number of operating facilities, sixty-two are located in communities over 100,000 population. Fifty-three are located in communities with a population under 5,000. Although the NF program seems to fit urban communities, ninety-nine of the 190 facilities are in small towns or rural areas under 25,000 population.

The percentage of response is somewhat even for all population groups except the small ones. Less than one half of the questionnaires were completed for facilities in small communities; thus analysis may be skewed for communities with less than 1,000 population.

The table below indicates frequency of response by population size of the communities in which facilities are located.

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES BY COMMUNITY POPULATION

Community Population	Total Number of Facilities	% of Total	Total No. of Responses	% of Response
Over 250,000	33	17%	21	64%
100,000 to 250,000	29	15%	29	100%
25,000 to 100,000	29	15%	25	85%
5,000 to 25,000	46	24%	38	83%
1,000 to 5,000	27	15%	20	74%
Less than 1,000	26	14%	12	46%
TOTAL	190	100%	145	

Survey Analysis

Information was summarized on:

° Facility Operations

-- length of operation

-- time lag between grant approval and date of operation

-- type of grant applicant

-- type of facility owner

-- type of facility operator

-- number of days and evenings open

-- average number of hours of operation per week

-- hour variation

-- annual operating budget amount

-- federal grant amount

-- number of services provided

° Facility Services

-- numbers and kinds of proposed and anticipated services

-- numbers and kinds of services provided but not proposed

-- types of agencies contacted for providing services and reasons services were not provided

-- numbers and ethnicity of persons served per week

The analysis of data focused on correlating these data items by community population, by number of services provided, and by average number of persons served. Correlating information in this way identified the characteristics of facilities providing fewer services than proposed and those providing greater ervices than proposed. Further, the analysis could test the following hypothesis:

° Small communities provide single-purpose rather than multipurpose facilities.

° Communities that do not provide all of the services proposed do so because of lack of funds, lack of staff and lack of agency commitment.

° Many centers are underutilized in terms of operating few days per week, few hours, or serving few clients.

Site Visits to Facilities

A sample was drawn for site visits based on quantitative information in the first 100 survey questionnaires. Thus, the survey phase and the site-visit phase overlapped. Although a ten percent sample was drawn, field staff actually visited 21 rather than 19 facilities. In addition to the 21 facilities, field teams made visits to all ten Regional Offices and 12 Area Offices the week of September 22 through 30, 1971.

The table below shows the distribution of facilities visited by region.

Region		Total Number Facilities	Number Visited
I	Boston	6	2
II	New York	9	1
III	Philadelphia	10	1
IV	Atlanta	43	4
V	Chicago	19	2
VI	Fort Worth	39	3
VII	Kansas City	17	1
VIII	Denver	12	2
IX	San Francisco	32	4
X	Seattle	3	1
	TOTAL	190	21

The facilities visited represent a cross-section of those in operation. Criteria for selection included:

- number of months in operation
- amount of operating budget
- type of operator
- number of hours in operation per week
- size of administrative core staff
- population of community

The sample includes at least one facility in each region; facilities on Indian reservations; and facilities in large cities, small towns, and rural areas. The sample was selected in conjunction with HUD Regional Offices.

Interviews were conducted with city government representatives, facility directors, administrative and service staff, and community organization representatives. The interview field guides are included in Appendix B of this report.

Information was gathered on:

° Facility Characteristics

  -- physical location

  -- interior/exterior design

  -- proportion of space and equipment in use all day

  -- distance from the center for users

  -- suitability of space and equipment

° Neighborhood Characteristics

  -- location in poverty/non-poverty area

  -- problems of the neighborhood

  -- racial distribution, income, education level, unemployment rate, welfare status of residents

  -- characteristics of users

° Facility History

  -- original purpose of construction and sponsors

  -- problems

  -- resident involvement

  -- length of operation

  -- programs and funding levels envisioned

  -- changes in problems and program focus

  -- present objective for facility use

° Facility Staffing

  -- table of organization

  -- size of staff units

  -- proportion of staff from neighborhood

-- characteristics of staff (race, sex, age, education, experience)

-- resident participation on boards and committees

° Program Description

-- verification of questionnaire

-- comprehensiveness and integration of services

-- responsiveness of facility to community needs

-- effectiveness of services

-- impact of facility on local agency practices, neighborhood social and economic environment

-- political environment

-- life-styles of the community

° Discrepancies Between Proposed Services Stated in Application and Provided Services

-- funding patterns for component services

-- kinds of linked programs receiving referrals from facilities

-- number of clients served by the facility and number referred to other agencies or programs

-- process for outreach diagnosis, referral, case management, follow-up, advocacy, community action and information dissemination

° Quality of Services

-- accessibility of the facility

-- acceptability of facility and staff to the community

-- immediacy of service

The primary purpose of gathering these data was to get a comprehensive, qualitative snapshot of the centers and programs, and the extent to which these centers and programs meet statutory and administrative policies and regulations. The secondary purpose of site visits was to validate the survey data.

Site visits to Field Offices

Site visits were made to all Regional Offices and to twelve Area Offices. Field teams interviewed HUD Assistant Regional Administrators for Community Development, Key Regional Community Development staff, Regional Housing Management staff, Program Managers, Area Office representatives; Regional Office of Economic Opportunity; and Regional Department of Health, Education, and Welfare staff. Interviews were held with HUD architect and engineering staff, HUD audit staff, and generally all persons knowledgeable about Neighborhood Facilities grant review, approval, technical assistance and project close-out.

Regional and Area Office personnel were queried with respect to:

- Project selection and funding,
- Monitoring and reporting,
- Providing training and technical assistance,
- Coordinating with other parts of HUD and with other agencies,
- Types of centers within their jurisdictions,
- Demand for the program,
- Problems with Neighborhood Facilities, and
- Recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the program.

The purposes of site visits to HUD field offices were (1) to identify the management procedures, problems, and issues; (2) to determine the impact of HUD procedures and policies on the program; and (3) to gather recommendations for making the program more effective and fulfilling statutory intent.

Seminars

At various stages in the study, the Evaluation Division staff of the Office of Community Development (HUD/CD) held informal seminars with HUD staff responsible for intergovernmental liaison and for Federal coordination and with HUD/CD executive staff to discuss interim findings and recommendations. The

seminars provided the media for translating findings and recommendations into immediate actions and decisions regarding the Neighborhood Facilities program.

Based on this final report, additional seminars and interagency meetings are anticipated. Seminars will be scheduled by the Office of Community Development with other parts of HUD, with other Federal agencies and with local Neighborhood Facilities staff as appropriate.

Chapter 3 addresses the findings of the study of Neighborhood Facilities. The findings relate to:

- Regional and Area Office management,
- Facility history,
- Facility operations,
- Facility services, and
- Facility staffing.

3. Findings

Two major themes surface from the Neighborhood Facilities Study:

1. Most centers are providing multi-service programs, which are available to low-income residents.

2. The Federal monitoring of the Neighborhood Facilities program needs improvement.

These themes are discussed within this chapter in terms of findings relevant to:

-- Facility Services

-- Facility Operations

-- Facility Staffing

-- HUD Program Management

The findings are a result of six months of intensive study of the many facets of the Neighborhood Facilities Program. Recommendations are not included in this chapter, but are discussed in Chapter 4. These recommendations stem from a pattern of findings, rather than individual findings.

Facility Services

No two neighborhoods are exactly alike and, not surprisingly, a wide range of neighborhood facilities exists. No single model typifies the design or function. The centers reflect the needs and wants of the community, staff and money resources available, and the competence of public and private agencies. Designs range from referral units in a single building or a facility built in connection with a school, to highly sophisticated and complex facilities operating from a cluster of buildings. Some centers are designed for comprehensive services, handling health problems, education, employment, housing, welfare, legal aid and the like from a centralized setting. Other centers focus on special purpose activities such as recreation.

Facility clients tend to be representative of the low-income areas in which they are located. A third of surveyed facilities serve black/Negro persons and a third serve a mixed ethnic community.

The following findings document the services provided and those proposed in applications.

FINDING ONE: MOST FACILITIES PROVIDE MORE THAN SEVEN TYPES OF SERVICES. OF THE 145 FACILITIES SURVEYED, ALMOST 70% (98) PROVIDE MORE THAN SEVEN TYPES OF SERVICES. IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE, THESE SERVICE TYPES INCLUDE:

-- Recreation
-- Social Services
-- Education
-- Health
-- Counseling
-- Employment Assistance
-- Senior Citizen Activities
-- Welfare Services
-- Day Care
-- Consumer Education
-- Library or Reading Room
-- Vocational Training
-- Rehabilitation Advice
-- Legal Aid
-- Relocation Advice

Ninety-three per cent (135) of the surveyed facilities provide at least four types of services. Only three facilities provide a single type of service, and five provide two or three types of service. Two facilities did not respond. Although a facility may provide a number of types of services, these multi-services may have one central focus. For example, one facility visited operates as a health center. The center staff trains student nurses, provides counseling to mothers, visits homes, and provides information to the community on nutrition, health care, and disease prevention.

On the other hand, single purpose facilities do not necessarily indicate underutilization. The health center mentioned provides education and vocational training to 30 persons per week, provides health care to 500 per week, provides counseling and social services to 18, and makes home visits and disseminates consumer information and aid to 250 persons per week. The center has a caseload of 1500 persons per month.

Many facilities are Community Centers which operate largely in a rural environment where the focus tends to be on meetings and recreational activities, with an offering of infrequent, periodic outreach type of social services. A Social Security representative or a health nurse, perhaps, spends one day per week or per month at the center to provide services to neighborhood residents. Few centers in a rural or small town setting apparently have the financial or staff resources that are necessary to provide full-time social services.

HUD Regional and Area Office staff note that the neighborhood center serves an important and necessary function regardless of the nature of the facility. The neighborhood center tends to become the focal point for the community and it is felt that the neighborhood involvement and participation developed at the center have a significant and beneficial impact on the daily lives of the residents.

Interviews with HUD field staff and facility personnel indicate universal support for the multi-purpose concept. At the same time, interviewees pointed to a need for single-purpose centers in both urban and rural communities. In rural areas the need is great for many types of services, but staff and resources are not available to support a multi-purpose center. In urban areas, a special need may exist for a single purpose facility, such as a one-stop employment center in a neighborhood with a high unemployment rate.

FINDING TWO: RECREATION ACTIVITIES ARE THE MOST FREQUENTLY PROVIDED SERVICES IN THE FACILITIES, SERVING MORE PERSONS PER WEEK THAN ANY OTHER ACTIVITY.

One hundred and twenty-five of the 145 facilities surveyed are providing recreation services. Other popular services include: education, health, counseling and social services.

Several facility directors interviewed said they hoped to use recreational aspects of the facility to initially attract the residents to the center where they could learn of the other services offered and anticipated.

Recreation programs in 54 facilities serve more than 100 persons per week with 42 of these facilities serving more than 300 persons per week.

After recreation, education and health services serve large numbers of persons per week. Of the 87 facilities providing educational activities, 24 serve more than 100 persons per week.

In contrast, advisory services reach the fewest persons per week. These services include: consumer aid and information, relocation and rehabilitation advice, legal aid, and reading rooms. Thirty-three per cent of all provided services reach less than 25 persons per week. Another nineteen per cent reach between 25 and 50 persons per week.

FINDING THREE: GENERALLY, SERVICES PROPOSED IN APPLICATION FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITY GRANTS ARE PROVIDED; HOWEVER HALF OF THE FACILITIES ARE UNABLE TO PROVIDE ALL SERVICES PROPOSED.

Eighty-five per cent of the services proposed in applications for Neighborhood Facilities grants are provided. However, 76 of 145 facilities surveyed are unable to provide all of the types of services proposed. Although most facilities had contacted several agencies for funding or locating services in the facilities, facility directors were unsuccessful in obtaining these services because of lack of funds or lack of agency commitment.

Over two-thirds (15) of the 21 large community facilities have failed to provide at least one of the services originally proposed. Thirteen facilities are unable to provide from one to six proposed services, but many of these services are planned for the future.

In the small communities, eighteen of the thirty-two facilities are not providing a proposed service. Sixteen facilities are unable to provide from one to four services - almost all of these are planned for future implementation.

Day care is the service most frequently proposed but not provided. Twenty-six facilities are not providing day care services as they had proposed in grant applications. Twenty-four are not providing proposed health services. Other types of unfurnished services named in order of frequency include: legal aid, library or reading room, senior citizen activity, education, and vocational training.

One-half of the services not provided are planned for a later date - providing the facilities can overcome staffing and other difficulties. Twenty per cent of the services, however, are not planned and ten per cent were provided but terminated.

Responses to the survey indicate that education and legal aid are most often terminated because there is no need for the service or a lack of resident use of the service. Facilities located on Indian reservations and activities designed for senior citizens result in the most frequent underutilization, according to survey returns and site visit reports.

From the time of application to the time of facility operation, three to four years had elapsed -- by which time many agencies that previously expressed an interest and/or commitment to house services in the center located elsewhere. Audits on twenty projects showed a range of 12 to 32 months lapsed from the date of contract to the date of construction acceptance by the community. The average time lag was nineteen months.

FINDING FOUR: LACK OF FUNDS IS THE MOST FREQUENT REASON FOR NOT PROVIDING SERVICES PROPOSED IN APPLICATIONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITY GRANTS.

One-fourth of the facilities which do not provide a proposed service indicate lack of funds as the primary reason. The next most frequent response is lack of agency commitment to locate services in the facility. Other reasons mentioned include: no staff, no equipment, and no need for service once the facility was operational.

City and private agencies frequently are approached for funding services in large city facilities, while county agencies frequently are approached for funding services in small community facilities.

Private agencies are most often approached for funding day care services. County agencies are most often approached for funding health services. Although county and private agencies are often cited as funding sources approached, most facilities contacted a number of agencies and types of funding sources for day care and health services including Federal, State, county, city, and private agencies. Few facilities cited no known contact for any services proposed but not provided.

One facility reported that child care services are not provided because the facility lacked the funds to bring part of the building up to acceptable standards. Another facility is not providing legal aid services because there is not enough room in the center, as the construction budget was reduced.

FINDING FIVE: ADDITIONAL SERVICES ARE PROVIDED WHICH WERE NOT PROPOSED IN APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS.

Thirty-seven facilities surveyed are providing civic activities and twenty-six are providing housing and home management services. These services are provided but were not proposed in applications. Other additional services mentioned in order of frequency include: relocation advice (18), counseling (18), consumer education (18), welfare services (17), rehabilitation advice (15), education (15), senior citizen activities (15), consumer aid (13), and health services (11).

One-fourth of the surveyed facilities anticipate providing additional services. Twenty-nine of these facilities anticipate providing day care; twenty-seven hope to provide legal aid services, and twenty-nine hope to provide services other than day care and legal aid. These services are planned in response to growing needs identified since the time of application for grants.

FINDING SIX: MULTI-SERVICE PROGRAMS DO NOT INSURE TOTAL USAGE OF THE FACILITY.

It appears that facility space is often underutilized. Twelve rural facilities were visited by one Regional Office and all were severely underutilized: many of the facilities have gymnasiums in use only evenings or have few services located in the facility. One Area Office's staff visited 17 facilities and found that twelve of these were underutilized. Generally, rural areas and Indian reservations have the greatest incidence of underutilization.

FINDING SEVEN: FACILITIES PROVIDE VARYING QUALITY OF SERVICE.

Twenty-one facilities were assessed for the quality of service with respect to accessibility, acceptability, immediacy, comprehensiveness, integration, responsiveness, effectiveness and impact on the community at large.

Most facilities visited were accessible to clients in terms of location in low-income neighborhoods and on major transportation lines. Rural facilities are rated inaccessible since public transportation is lacking and distances prohibit walking to the facility for service. Few facilities provide 24-hour emergency telephone service and few provide emergency service after 5 p.m.

All facilities visited are rated acceptable to the community. Buildings are attractive; buildings in rural areas are rated superior to other structures in the communities. In cities, there is a tendency for windows to be bricked-in and all entrances save one to be locked because of increasing vandalism. All workers appeared to be courteous and friendly.

The immediacy or promptness of client receipt of direct services is difficult to determine. Information on average wait time and proportion of walk-ins to appointments is not available. Observations of facilities visited seemed to indicate that facilities wait-time compared favorably with other institutions.

Services tend to be comprehensive and integrated in large city facilities where a mini-city hall concept prevails (e.g., provide a satellite operation for all the services offered by a city). In other places, services often are fragmented.

Although most facilities aim to be responsive to community wishes and need, few facilities have a capability for planning or studying community needs.

In terms of effectiveness and impact, most centers visited are providing extension of existing services to populations which were not reached prior to the facility operation. While the facilities impact on the social and recreational environment of the neighborhood, there is little evidence of impact on agency practices economic and political environment of the community-at-large.

FINDING EIGHT: FACILITIES IN LARGE CITIES AND IN MODEL CITIES HAVE MORE SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS THAN FACILITIES IN OTHER COMMUNITIES.

Regional and Area Office staff point to facilities funded through Model Cities as successful. Model Cities have a social system in place and fund mechanisms for staffing facilities, for provision of services, and for social planning.

Facilities in large communities, according to survey results and field staff perceptions, have resources for providing direct services and administrative services. These facilities serve more clients with more services more hours a week than facilities in small communities.

The rural localities which applied for the program were given grants on the basis of incidence of rural poverty as measured by dollar income. According to interviews, rural communities have had difficulty with the Neighborhood Facilities program because these communities had no organized system for providing a wide variety of social services. In most of these communities, the school is the center of community organization. Where a community is not a county seat, community leaders saw a need for a center where civic groups could meet. Community leaders adjusted applications to fit the urban Eastern concept of a settlement house for ethnic minorities. In other cases, community leaders sincerely wanted to mount additional programs, but had no resources available.

FACILITY OPERATIONS

Data on facility operations were gathered from survey results on 145 facilities and on site visits to 21 facilities. The majority of these facilities were in operation between six months and four years. Six were in operation less than six months and twelve were in operation more than four years.

This section addresses survey findings on:

-- Types of agencies owning and operating facilities,

-- Types of grant applicants,

-- Number of days and evenings facilities are open per week,

-- Average number of hours of operation per week, and

-- Amounts of operating budgets.

FINDING NINE: CITY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ARE THE MOST FREQUENT OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF FACILITIES.

Two-thirds (96) of the facilities surveyed were owned by city government agencies. The remainder were owned by county agencies (15), private non-profit agencies (11), Indian tribes (4), Community Action Programs (4), and by school boards (3). Two facilities did not respond and the remainder (10) were owned by a combination of other types of agencies.

Almost half (65) of the facilities are operated by agencies. Private non-profit agencies operate 43 facilities. County agencies operate ten facilities, Community Action Programs (CAPs) operate seven, and school boards operate two facilities. The remainder (17) are operated by a combination of other agencies. One facility did not respond.

The types of owners and operators differ with community population size. In large and medium size cities, facilities are usually owned and operated by city government agencies or by private agencies. In small towns and rural areas, facilities tend to be owned and operated by county agencies, CAPs or school boards.

Four facilities are owned by the city but operated by the local CAP. According to interviews with field staff, there are difficulties with this arrangement. CAP's generally want to be advocates of the poverty community and see their independence threatened under any local government umbrella. Local governments want facilities to be tailored to traditional agency programs and civic organizations rather than tailored to CAP missions and target populations.

On-site interviews identified problems which arise when facilities are owned and operated by Indian tribes. These facilities, as a rule, lack the services and the administrative capability to make the centers effective. Often there is a low level of building maintenance in facilities OWNED and operated by tribes.

FINDING TEN: FACILITIES IN LARGE COMMUNITIES HAVE PROPORTIONATELY LARGER OPERATING BUDGETS THAN THOSE IN SMALL COMMUNITIES.

The survey questionnaire requested respondents to indicate present annual operating budget amounts. Facilities' operating budgets are difficult to compare, since the amounts sometimes include costs of delivering services as well as of administration of the facility. Twenty-two percent (32) of the respondents either did not have information on the budget amounts or did not respond.

Facilities in small communities have considerably smaller budgets than facilities in larger communities. Of thirty-two facilities in communities under 5,000 population, fifteen were operating on budgets of less than $15,000 per year. Only two had budgets of over $120,000, the remainder had budgets between $30,000 and $60,000. Many of the questionnaires indicate that the operating budgets of many small community NFs cover only maintenance costs and custodial services.

Facilities in large communities with more than a 250,000 population have more administrative services and staff than facilities in small communities. As a result, their operating budgets are larger. Of the twenty-one facilities in large communities responding to the questionnaire, eight had an annual operating budget of over $120,000, and fifteen reported a budget greater than $60,000.

Responses on 145 facilities indicate that 25 have budgets less than $15,000; 27 have budgets between $15,000 and $30,000; 18 have budgets between $30,000 and $60,000; 25 have budgets between $60,000 and $120,000; and 18 have budgets over $120,000. Thirty-two facilities did not respond.

The median budget for the 145 facilities was $37,626 and the range was from 0 to $992,504.

FINDING ELEVEN: MOST FACILITIES ARE OPEN AT LEAST FIVE DAYS, FOUR NIGHTS, AND AT LEAST 40 HOURS A WEEK.

Almost all facilities (141) are open at least 5 days a week and 2/3 (87) are open 6 or 7 days a week. Fewer facilities are open at night. Over one-third (53) of the facilities surveyed are open six or seven evenings a week. Three-fourths (106) of the facilities are open at least four nights a week.

Facilities were asked to report the average number of hours they are open per week. All but 20% are open at least 40 hours a week. Of the 145 facilities surveyed, twenty-six facilities are open less than 40 hours; fifty-two are open between 41 and 60 hours; forty-five facilities are open between 61 and 80 hours; and twenty are open over 80 hours; and two facilities did not respond. The average number of hours of operation per week is 62.

There is a correlation between community size and the number of hours a facility is open. In the large communities (over 250,000 population), only one facility was operating less than 40 hours per week as compared to nine facilities in the small communities (under 5,000 population). Almost half of the large community facilities (9 out of 21) are open from 61 to 80 hours. In the small communities, ten out of thirty-two facilities are open between 41 to 60 hours.

The on-site visits revealed that facility hours may vary according to the particular service. For example, one facility is open an average of 45 hours a week, but the library (which occupies 25% of the space) is open for only 15 hours a week because of lack of funds.

The on-site visits indicated that many facilities provide services on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and are used nightly for meetings, classes, and recreational activities.

One-fourth of the facilities surveyed indicated a change in hours between spring-summer and the rest of the year. The majority reported an increase in hours because of increased recreation programs during the spring and summer months.

FACILITY STAFFING

Survey respondents were asked to list all paid individuals who regularly work in the facility as administrative staff. In addition, respondents were asked to supply information on all services including core administrative services provided during the months of April, May and June, 1971.

The following findings are based on survey results and on-site visit information.

FINDING TWELVE: MOST FACILITIES HAVE FULL-TIME DIRECTORS.

Of the 145 facilities surveyed, two-thirds (99) have a full-time director. Nine per cent (13) have a part-time director and four per cent (6) had vacancies for a director. Fifteen per cent (22) indicated either a full-time or part-time director, paid from sources other than the facility's payroll. These directors may be detailed from a city recreation department, YWCA, Community Action Agency or other local agency.

All facilities (71) operating more than 60 hours per week have at least one director and many have a full-time director and a part-time or outstation director. Facilities (21) operating more than 80 hours a week usually are staffed with two or more directors.

In addition to a director, forty-four of the 145 facilities surveyed have one or more full-time deputy or assistant directors. Thirteen have one or more part-time deputies or assistant directors, six have vacancies, and three have deputies supplied by other agencies.

The most common types of positions in addition to the director and deputy include the intake receptionist, the outstation worker, and clerical and custodial workers.

FINDING THIRTEEN: FACILITIES IN LARGE COMMUNITIES TEND TO HAVE CORE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF, WHILE THOSE IN SMALL COMMUNITIES RARELY HAVE MORE THAN A DIRECTOR.

One-third (7) of the communities with population over 250,000 have more than 26 full-time employees; nine facilities have between six and twenty-five full time employees while the remainder (5) have less than six full-time employees.

In comparison only one of thirty-two small community NF's had more than twenty-six full-time staff. Almost half of the facilities in small communities report full-time staffs of less than five people. Often these positions are custodial rather than administrative.

Residents from the community served by the facility are represented in small numbers of facility staff. Almost half of the facilities in small communities report full-time staffs of less than five people. Often these positions are custodial rather than administrative.

Residents from the community served by the facility are represented in small numbers on facility staff. The most frequent role of residents in facility administration is membership on Boards of Directors which plan facility activities.

FINDING FOURTEEN: FACILITIES WHICH PROVIDED CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TEND TO OFFER MORE SERVICES AND TEND TO BE OPEN MORE HOURS.

Almost half of the facilities (63) provide some type of core administrative services. These core administrative services include: intake, outreach, referral, and coordination. Intake includes provision of general information to potential clients, assisting clients in completing applications and directing them to the appropriate facility service. Outreach includes activities reaching out into the area to inform and advise residents of facility services. Referral includes sending clients to other agencies and sources of service. Coordination includes orchestrating agencies which provide direct services through the center. Few facilities fill a client advocacy or social action role typified by CAPs.

Of 145 facilities surveyed, thirty-nine per cent (56) provide referral services; thirty per cent (44) provide coordination with other agencies; thirty per cent (42) provide outreach; and twenty-seven per cent (39) of the surveyed NFs provide intake services.

Facilities providing more than seven services generally provide core services as well. Ninety per cent (57) of the facilities with core services offered more than seven types of services.

Facilities open over sixty hours were most likely to have large core staffs. The mean staff size for those facilities (71) open more than 60 hours per week is 19.3 as compared to 9.1 for those facilities (29) operating less than 40 hours per week.

FINDING FIFTEEN: QUALITY OF SERVICES AND PHYSICAL WORKING CONDITIONS ARE MAJOR FACTORS THAT AID IN RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF QUALIFIED PERSONNEL. SALARIES ARE THE BIGGEST HINDRANCE.

Facilities were asked to identify factors affecting the facility's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel and how staffing problems were rectified. At least half (73) of the facilities found that quality of services and the physical working conditions generally aided in recruiting and retaining qualified staff. Other factors which aid in attracting staff include: fringe benefits (48), geographic location of the facility (41) and job security (40). Those mentioned as aids to retaining staff included: fringe benefits (53); staff development opportunities (51) and proximity to educational facilities (44).

More than one-fourth of the facilities (40) indicate that salaries hinder recruiting and retaining staff. Other negative factors include promotional opportunities (23), job security (22), and hours in work-week (20).

One-fourth of the facilities (38) have no staffing problems. A small number of facilities (17) indicate that staffing problems existed, but no steps had been taken to rectify them. Most facilities with staffing problems have increased salaries (7), provided on-the-job training (10) and allowed time off for college course work (3), or some multiple of these steps (43).

HUD PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Data on the Regional and Area Office staff perception of their management roles were obtained from on-site field interviews. The program was first administered by a Central Office Neighborhood Facilities unit in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Urban Renewal and by a Regional Neighborhood Facilities Officer. The NF Officer, together with Regional architect and engineering staff, performed all pre-application site visits and application reviews using HUD guidelines described in RHA 7350.1, Neighborhood Facilities Grant Program Applicant Handbook. The NF Officer, upon review of applications, made recommendations for approval to the HUD Assistant Regional Administrator for Urban Renewal. On request, the Regional Housing Management Social Services Officer reviewed and commented on applications primarily when the center proposed to be located in or near public housing. Upon completion of a facility, the Regional Audit staff visited the site to determine the eligibility of costs. Generally, the audit report resulting from this visit "closed out" the project and marked HUD's final action on a project. Project files were either sent to storage or maintained but not used for monitoring facility operations. In 1970, the program was transferred to the Office of Metropolitan Development and in 1971, it was transferred to the Office of Community Development.

Responsibility for the program, including fund resolutions and files was transferred from the Regional Offices with the establishment of Area Offices.

FINDING SIXTEEN: REGIONS AND AREA OFFICE STAFF ARE UNCLEAR ON THE EXTENT OF HUD'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE NF PROGRAM.

Section 703 of the Act providing grants for Neighborhood Facilities states that:

> "For a period of twenty years after a grant has been made under this section for a neighborhood facility, such facility shall not, without the approval of the Secretary, be converted to uses other than those proposed by the applicant in its application for a grant."

Disagreement exists on the interpretation of the twenty-year interest in the facility. Many assume that the responsibility rests with the local public body and that HUD management responsibility ends with the construction completion. Proponents of the theory that HUD management interest ends with construction completion maintain that the statutory intent is to place the burden on the locality. Proponents claim that HUD has few resources to monitor communities for twenty years with regard to the use of the facility in terms of providing services originally proposed in applications. Further, as community needs and resources change, the facility services, uses, and clients vary from the projections made at time of applications.

On the other hand, there are those who interpret the statute to place responsibility on HUD for overseeing facility use after construction. Advocates of HUD's twenty-year responsibility are critical of the lack of monitoring of operational centers. Advocates claim that if the program is to be viable, Regional Offices must: (1) visit and monitor operating centers, (2) maintain files necessary for monitoring, (3) seek reports on facility operations, and (4) provide training and technical assistance to facilities.

At the time of the study, there was no systematic NF monitoring or reporting following construction completion. Until time of final payment for facility construction, engineering and audit reviews were made and - in a limited number of cases - staff visited centers.

Following "project close-out" few visits were made to operational centers by either Regional or Area Offices and no reporting was done for operating centers. However, over the last six months, there has been a steady increase of interest in assessing the program and of visiting centers.

FINDING SEVENTEEN: ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS DO NOT ACCOMMODATE SINGLE PURPOSE FACILITIES WHICH ARE NEEDED IN SOME COMMUNITIES.

The statute provides that:

"No grant shall be made under this section for any project, unless the Secretary determines that the

project will provide a neighborhood facility which is (1) necessary for carrying out a program of health, recreation, social or similar community service (including a community action program approved under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the area), (2) consistent with the comprehensive planning for the development of the community and (3) so located as to be available for the use by a significant portion (or number in the case of large urban places) of the area's low - or moderate - income residents."

Some of the Central Office and Field Office staff interpret the legislation to mean that facilities may be funded which have but one or two services or uses. Proponents of this "single-purpose" concept refer to the legislative history which discusses funding facilities - "some of which will be multi-purpose".

Others support the interpretation expressed in the NF Handbook. Existing administrative requirements in the Neighborhood Facilities Grant Program Applicants Handbook dated November 1969 specify that:

"Program assistance is limited to multi-purpose facilities. A multi-purpose facility is one which provides a wide range of services such as health, welfare, recreational, cultural, social and other similar community services (including a Community Action Program) needed in the area. A facility devoted predominantly to health or recreation, for example, is not considered multi-purpose."

Even in those instances, where the multi-purpose requirement was rigorously enforced in application review and project approval, some single purpose facilities evolved. Interviews with Regional and Area Office staff suggest these reasons for single purpose facility development:

-- Lack of funds to provide services,

-- Lack of staff to carry out services,

-- Lack of local expertise in obtaining commitments of service agencies to locate in the center,

-- Lack of coordination of service delivery once the building was occupied, and

-- Lack of local intent to provide services proposed.

Some localities, particularly in rural areas, contracted to build multi-purpose facilities while never intending to provide multi-services. Many of these facilities were intended as extensions of the schools. A review of one region's audits performed on facilities within the past twelve months supports this problem. Of the twenty audits performed, six facilities were not utilized as intended. Misuse included: use as storage for school equipment, use as temporary classrooms, spectator-oriented use of the gymnasium, use for school lunches, use for school recreation and driver education, and use for swimming and school recreation programs. In many of these cases, community leaders saw an opportunity for a needed recreation center, meeting house, or school gym; architect and engineering consultants saw an opportunity for packaging their skills at a profit; or the community-at-large wanted a "multi-purpose room" to hold dances and wedding parties.

In some instances, the encouragement from the Regional Office to build a multi-purpose room resulted in underutilization of facilities since a large room which could be used as a gym or auditorium was not appropriate for health services, family counseling or day care.

Turnover of community leaders and of community populations has resulted in a turnover of needs and services. Communities have had difficulties in following the plans put forth in their applications as a result. Some communities saw a need arise for a special purpose facility, such as health or recreation, and deviated from the purposes intended in the original contract. Many times the success or failure of the facility depended on the initiative of an executive director who could mobilize resources. Without a director, many communities could not provide multiple services. Field staff have been unable to force communities to use a center in a way other than that which met their own needs and circumstances.

Multi-purpose facilities, according to interviewees, are most successful in large cities and in Model Cities which could commit funds, staff, programs, and agency cooperation to the facility. Small communities have no or few services to locate in the facility.

The proposed Neighborhood Facilities Handbook (September 15, 1971) provides more flexibility with regard to facility purposes and services:

"Neighborhood Facilities must provide one or more health, recreation, social or similar community services for a period of twenty years. The scope of services will be determined both by the problems to be addressed and by the availability of resources to deal with them."

FINDING EIGHTEEN: THE PRESENT APPLICATION PROCEDURE IS CUMBERSOME AND COSTLY FOR LOCALITIES AND FEDERAL OFFICES.

Where information and cost estimates are preliminary in nature, a two-step application procedure is used. A combined Part I and II application may be filed at the discretion of the applicant.

Part I proposes use, describes social and physical planning, states needs and provides assurance of completion. Upon approval of a Part I application, a reservation of grant funds is established.

Part II provides definitive information on social and physical aspects of project development and resolves issues raised in the review and approval of Part I. Upon approval of the Part II application, an allocation of funds is made which authorizes a grant contract.

Although applicants may request a pre-application conference, the applicant must file a full technical application before a reservation can be made. According to Area Office sources, the application takes an average of six months to prepare. In man-days of effort and in consultant assistance, preparing application can be costly.

Field Office staff feel the workload on Area Office staff in reviewing technical applications may not be justified in light of few applications which can be funded.

A simplified application is recommended by Area Office staff.

The proposed Neighborhood Facilities Handbook provides for such simplification.

The proposed application submission and processing requirements provide for:

-- A pre-application conference of the Area Office representative and the applicant to avoid misunderstandings and to eliminate the need for after-the-fact detailed review of applications submitted to HUD for approval and funding;

-- A one-time application submission which limits the amount of information to be provided and which provides for performance certification (compliance with Civil Rights Act, Equal Employment Opportunity, etc.)

-- Optional project rating prior to submission of complete application;

-- Notification to the applicant of the results of application evaluation within seven days of Area Office Receipt;

-- Application review and project approval.

Although the proposed application requirements are not in place, some offices have made refinements in existing procedures which are designed to be consistent with the pattern used for other programs: (1) Interested party makes contact with HUD; (2) HUD representative talks to sponsor; (3) If the project is feasible and meets project selection criteria, HUD negotiates any differences with the applicant and, on request, assists in preparation of the application; (4) HUD technical review consists of a once-a-project review performed through the regular review channels, i.e., Equal Opportunity, Social Services, Relocation, Program Field Services, Engineering, Legal Services.

FINDING NINETEEN: PROJECT SELECTION SYSTEMS USED TO REVIEW APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CHOOSE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING HAVE DEFICIENCIES.

Two types of deficiencies in project selection systems frequently were noted by Regional and Area Office staff: (1) weak criteria in some areas, and (2) hap-hazard use of the systems.

Historically, there was little demand for the program. It was unpublicized and few communities understood that the program existed and what HUD could provide. Regions were encouraged to interest communities in the program when it first started. The project selection criteria were considered sufficiently broad to accommodate most applications. As demand for the program increased, however, Area Offices find the criteria lacking refinement necessary to choose between proposed projects.

In general, both the Regional and Area Offices evaluate NF applications on the basis of project selection criteria and funding requirements set forth in the administrative guidelines for the NF program--degree of poverty in the center service area, responsiveness to the needs of the neighborhood the center will serve, and provision of services through a multi-purpose system.

The Neighborhood Facilities Grant Program Applicant Handbook, RHA 7350.1, (November 1969) and the draft Regional and Area Office Processing Procedures (September 1970) rank applications on the degree of poverty, neighborhood involvement, examination of problem characteristics, program planning process, and coordination of services. Where demand is low, quality of funded applications is lower than when demand is high. Project selection criteria are criticized by HUD field staff for emphasis on mechanics, lack of emphasis on capability of the community to provide staff and funds for facility services, and lack of emphasis on operator capability to administer facility services. Present criteria can be met easily by packagers who prepare applications for communities who are not committed to a facility's use.

The new project selection system proposed for the Neighborhood Facilities program requires the following criteria be used for evaluating applications:

* Relationship to comprehensive planning
* Income level of area to be served
* Relevance of program objectives
* Capacity to administer the neighborhood facility
* Local equal employment effort
* Local need

* Commitment of Local, State and Federal entities to project or program
* Expansion of housing for low and moderate income families
* Community Development

Applications received a point rating for each criteria. Prior to this full technical review of applications, submissions receive a preliminary review against five prerequisites related to relocation, A-95 coordination, civil rights compliance, area served, and project location.

FINDING TWENTY: AREA OFFICE CAN FUND FEW PROJECTS EACH YEAR, ALTHOUGH DEMAND FOR THE PROGRAM HAS INCREASED.

While the funding level for NF has been stable for the past two or three years, demand for the program has increased and construction costs have increased. Further, allocations to Area Offices, particularly in the South and the Southwest, have decreased.

Nation-wide the NF program has 535 projects in some stage of funding or operation in 462 localities. Funds for rehabilitation or construction of facilities are limited at present to $40,000,000 per fiscal year. Funds are allocated to the Regional Offices who allocate monies to 36 Area Offices. Thus, each Area Office with approximately one million dollars allocation, is able to fund from one to four facilities a year.

There is currently a large backlog of applications in all regions. One Regional office estimates it may take two years to fund the approvable applications if funding levels stay the same. Many applications are rejected because of lack of funds. Regional staff feel they could easily fund three times the current number of approvals with quality projects.

At present, Area Offices are discouraging communities from applying for NF grants because of shortage of funding. In 1970, despite discouraging a number of communities from applying, one Area Office received 35 applications, returned 25 and funded two. Further demand for the program is stimulated by the Economic Development Agency (EDA), whose field staff is encouraging communities to apply. Packagers, marketing their services in preparing applications and facility specifications, also increase demand.

FINDING TWENTY-ONE: AREA AND REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF RECOGNIZE A NEED FOR GREATER INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION IN APPLICATIONS REVIEW AND ASSISTANCE TO NFs.

In most Regional and Area Offices there is little or no coordination between Community Development staff and Housing Management's Community Services staff or other parts of HUD. In one region, however, responsibility for Neighborhood Facilities has been located in the Community Services Section of the Housing Management and Community Services Division. The Community Services staff works in concert with the program team in reviewing NF applications and rendering technical assistance to communities during application and implementation of NF projects.

Generally, little coordination exists between Community Development (CD), the Department of Health, E..cation and Welfare (HEW), or the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO). Both HEW and OEO traditionally fund services in facilities. CD consultation with other Federal agencies prior to grant approval and at the time of project close-out, according to some interviewees, might assure quality in facility service delivery.

FINDING TWENTY-TWO: EACH AREA OFFICE HAS ITS OWN FUNDING STRATEGY WITH RESPECT TO APPROVING FUNDABLE PROJECTS.

Area Offices that have a great demand for NF grants, choose a few projects for approval from a number of quality applications which rank high on project selection systems. Some Area Office personnel give priority to applications which are sponsored by Model City Agencies. Others give priority to applications which are sponsored by large and medium-size cities. Others give priority to rural areas with a high incidence of poverty.

With regard to program selectivity, some Area Offices give priority to social program delivery rather than referral services; or to employment programs rather than recreation programs. Other Area Offices prefer funding a number of low-cost facilities rather than a few high-cost facilities. A few prefer funding rehabilitation of existing structures to new construction.

Thus, although selection systems can aid in identifying quality fundable projects, Area Offices make grants to communities using other criteria.

4. Recommendations

The twenty-two findings in Chapter 3 suggest policy clarifications, procedural modifications, guidance and management actions. The pattern of findings resulted in the following recommendations which are organized by Policy Procedures, Guidance, and Program Management.

POLICY

1. Clarify the legislative intent of Section 703 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which provides grants for Neighborhood Facilities with regard to the numbers and types of services, uses, and purposes eligible for funding. (See Findings 5 and 17.)

2. Clarify the legislative intent of HUD's responsibility for facility use for twenty-years after a grant is made. (See Finding 16.)

3. Explore increased funding of the NF program for Fiscal Year 1973. (See Findings 20 and 22.)

4. Develop a funding strategy that more closely relates to HUD priorities and to Urban Growth policies. The strategy should reflect HUD priorities for urban and rural development, Model Cities, and other aspects of community development. (See Findings 20 and 22.)

5. Explore earmarking part of grant fund allocations for operating expenses for core staff and services. (See Findings 10, 13, and 14.)

6. Develop criteria for minimum staffing and services that must be present before final disbursement of funds is made to a facility. (See Findings 13 and 14.)

PROCEDURES

7. Implement revised project selection system for Neighborhood Facilities grants. (See Finding 19.)

8. Implement simplified application procedure for NF grants. (See Finding 18.)

9. Clarify contract amendment procedures for Neighborhood Facilities projects. (See Findings 3 and 5.)

10. Coordinate Neighborhood Facilities program application, review and grants with other Federal programs providing funds for services. (See Finding 21.)

GUIDANCE

11. Provide guidance to facilities on administration, eligible uses, and funding resources. (See Findings 3, 4, 6, and 7.)

12. Provide communities with sample designs for NF construction, including designs for modular construction, that would accommodate various center uses. (See Findings 3, 6, and 7.)

13. Provide training for Area Office staff and for facility directors on NF administration, planning, programming, and evaluation. (See Findings 13, 19, 20, 21, and 22.)

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

14. Clarify Area Offices monitoring responsibilities. (See Finding 16.)

15. Regional Offices should control quality of Area Offices' project selection, funding, monitoring, and technical assistance. Regional Offices should reallocate funds between Areas in relation to demand. (See Findings 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.)

Other immediate recommendations related to the study have been implemented. Actions taken on immediate recommendations are discussed in the next chapter.

5. Action Taken

Following an analysis of 100 survey questionnaires and the site-visits phase a preliminary report was written. The preliminary report was presented to key Community Development and other HUD staff on October 8, 1971. This report contained an overview of the study, major findings, and recommendation for both immediate administrative changes and long-range changes. The report was accepted with minor changes and the decision was made to implement the immediate administrative changes.

The following actions have been taken as a result of the evaluation:

1. A telegram was issued to all Regional Administrators and Area Office Directors on October 12, 1971, rescinding the 30 day funding moratorium on Neighborhood Facility projects with the following exceptions:

   - Where the owner or operator is a school, school board or school district, and

   - Where the owner or operator is a non-profit organization sponsored by a religious or sectarian organization or group.

   The two exceptions were made because of legal problems with such sponsors; the HUD Office of General Counsel is reviewing these problems.

   Field Offices were advised by the telegram to follow existing project selection systems and handbook requirements in all cases of funding applications.

2. The Assistant Secretary for Community Development issued a memo on October 29, 1971 which forwarded the preliminary evaluation report for Regional and Area Office feedback, review and comment. The memo indicated the status of the evaluation and made several recommendations for immediate administrative changes in accordance with the study. The recommendations included:

- Review all Neighborhood Facility projects, including approved, under construction, and operating, and meet with the city or appropriate sponsor to reaffirm the contract agreement as to commitments for the service program. Where there are discrepancies between the planned and operating or potential services, HUD should request a justification for the changes. The purpose of this is to promote greater utilization of the facility by developing feasible and appropriate service programs and to reach agreement on the changes in the use of the facility.

- Area Offices should monitor operational centers at least once a year for three years following construction by on-site inspection.

- Neighborhood Facility files necessary for monitoring should be retrieved from storage and maintained in the Area Offices.

3. Prior to the evaluation study, HUD had entered into negotiations with HEW to solicit their assistance in the review of Neighborhood Facility applications and cooperation in the program generally. The evaluation highlighted the need for HEW review since HEW funds many facility services. After HEW's review of the study, the need for joint review and assistance was reinforced. The formal agreement between the two agencies is expected shortly. OEO also reacted favorably to the evaluation and is eager to enter into a similar agreement and to address other problems identified in the evaluation, such as the burden for administrative and social planning costs on communities. The purpose of these agreements is to identify resources and facilitate local commitment of resources to the program.

4. The evaluation report resulted in several recommendations for changes in program eligibility, application procedures, funding, and HUD program management. As appropriate, these recommendations are being blended into a new handbook and project selection system for Neighborhood Facilities. The evaluation clarified and reinforced the need for simplified and consolidated applications and for standard criteria for assessing applications. Elements of the evaluation that have been incorporated into the project selection system include area to be served, project location and

accessibility, relevance of program objectives, capacity to administer the neighborhood facility, local need, coordination of existing services, and commitment of local, state and Federal entities to the project.

Other recommendations will be implemented by appropriate HUD staff in order to improve the effectiveness of the program and HUD's management.

Appendixes

A. NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES PROGRAM SURVEY

B. NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES FIELD GUIDES

C. TABLES WHICH SUMMARIZE SURVEY DATA

Appendix A

OMB #63S71009
Expiration Date: 12-71

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Washington, D. C. 20410

July 1971

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES PROGRAM SURVEY

This survey is designed to gather descriptive information on the services being provided by all operating neighborhood facilities. Part I requests general information about the facility's services, operations, and staffing. Part II requests information on proposed services. Part III requests information on services provided. Part IV requests specific information on staffing.

Please respond to all questions as they relate to your facility for the period April through June 1971. Space for comments and explanations is provided on the last page. If information is not available for any item, please note this on the comments page.

Name of Facility/Center: _____

Address of Facility/Center: _____
(Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Name of Facility Director: _____

Name of Respondent: _____

Title of Respondent: _____

Date Center Began Operation: _____
(Month) (Year)

Name of Federal Grant Applicant: _____

_____

Total Annual Operating Budget: $_____

DO NOT MARK

CARD 1

___ (1-3)
__ (4-5)
__ (6-7)
____ (8-11)
__ (12-13)
_ (14)
_ (15)
_ (16)
_ (17)
_____ (18-22)
_____ (23-27)
_ (28)

PART I

DO NOT MARK

(NOTE: SPACE FOR COMMENTS PROVIDED ON LAST PAGE)

1. Which of the following organizations owns the center:

CHECK ONE

City Agency..... _____(1)
County Agency..... _____(2)
Private non-profit agency..... _____(3)

Other, (Specify): _____..... _____(9) ___(29)

NAME OF AGENCY:_____

2. Which of the following organizations operates the center?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

City agency..... _____(1)
County agency..... _____(2)
Private non-profit agency..... _____(3)

Other, (Specify): _____..... _____(9) ___(30)

NAME OF AGENCY: _____

3. For the months April, May, June 1971, please indicate those days the center was open mornings and afternoons.

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Mondays..... _____(1)
Tuesdays..... _____(2)
Wednesdays..... _____(3)
Thursdays..... _____(4)
Fridays..... _____(5)
Saturdays..... _____(6)
Sundays..... _____(7) ___(31)

4. For the months April, May, June 1971, please indicate those days the center was open evenings after 7 p.m.

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Mondays..... _____(1)
Tuesdays..... _____(2)
Wednesdays..... _____(3)
Thursdays..... _____(4)
Fridays..... _____(5)
Saturdays..... _____(6)
Sundays..... _____(7) ___(32)

DO NOT MARK

5. For the months April, May, June 1971, please indicate the average number of hours per week the center was open.

_____ average number of hours per week. __(33-34)

6. For the months April, May, June 1971, how do the average number of hours per week compare with other calendar quarters?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

No difference.....	_____	(1)
Increased hours.....	_____	(2)
Decreased hours.....	_____	(3)
Other, (Specify): _____.....	_____	(9) __(35)

If number of hours has changed, please indicate the reason in the space provided. (Example: Increased recreation programs.)

_____

_____

_____ __(36)

7. Please indicate which services listed below were originally proposed in the application for neighborhood facilities funds.

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Relocation Advice.....	_____	__(37)
Rehabilitation Advice.....	_____	__(38)
Education.....	_____	__(39)
Employment Assistance.....	_____	__(40)
Vocational Training.....	_____	__(41)
Day Care.....	_____	__(42)
Health.....	_____	__(43)
Housing/Home Management.....	_____	__(44)
Welfare Services.....	_____	__(45)
Counseling.....	_____	__(46)
Social Services.....	_____	__(47)
Consumer Education Information.....	_____	__(48)
Consumer Aid.....	_____	__(49)
Legal Aid.....	_____	__(50)
Recreation.....	_____	__(51)
Library/Reading Room.....	_____	__(52)
Senior Citizen Activities.....	_____	__(53)
Other, (Specify): _____.....	_____	__(54)
_____	_____	__(55)
_____	_____	__(56)
_____	_____	__(57)

DO NOT MARK

8. Please indicate which services listed below were offered during April, May, and June 1971.

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	DO NOT MARK
Relocation Advice	_____	___(58)
Rehabilitation Advice	_____	___(59)
Education	_____	___(60)
Employment Assistance	_____	___(61)
Vocational Training	_____	___(62)
Day Care	_____	___(63)
Health	_____	___(64)
Housing/Home Management	_____	___(65)
Welfare Services	_____	___(66)
Counseling	_____	___(67)
Social Services	_____	___(68)
Consumer Education Information	_____	___(69)
Consumer Aid	_____	___(70)
Legal Aid	_____	___(71)
Recreation	_____	___(72)
Library/Reading Room	_____	___(73)
Senior Citizen Activities	_____	___(74)
Other, (Specify): _____	_____	___(75)
_____	_____	___(76)
_____	_____	___(77)
_____	_____	___(78)
		__(79-80)

9. Please indicate which services (not presently provided) are anticipated.

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	DO NOT MARK CARD 2
Relocation Advice	_____	___(29)
Rehabilitation Advice	_____	___(30)
Education	_____	___(31)
Employment Assistance	_____	___(32)
Vocational Training	_____	___(33)
Day Care	_____	___(34)
Health	_____	___(35)
Housing/Home Management	_____	___(36)
Welfare Services	_____	___(37)
Counseling	_____	___(38)
Social Services	_____	___(39)
Consumer Education Information	_____	___(40)
Consumer Aid	_____	___(41)
Legal Aid	_____	___(42)
Recreation	_____	___(43)
Library/Reading Room	_____	___(44)
Senior Citizen Activities	_____	___(45)
Other, (Specify): _____	_____	___(46)
_____	_____	___(47)

DO NOT MARK

10. In your opinion, how do the following factors affect your facility's ability to recruit qualified personnel?

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY				
	Detracts (1)	Neutral (2)	Aids (3)	Don't Know (9)	
Quality of Services.....	___	___	___	___	___(48)
Caseloads.....	___	___	___	___	___(49)
Salary.....	___	___	___	___	___(50)
Hours in work week.....	___	___	___	___	___(51)
Job Security.....	___	___	___	___	___(52)
Fringe Benefits.....	___	___	___	___	___(53)
Geographic location of Facility	___	___	___	___	___(54)
Physical working conditions....	___	___	___	___	___(55)
Promotional Opportunities.....	___	___	___	___	___(56)
Staff Development Opportunities	___	___	___	___	___(57)
Proximity to Educational Facilities	___	___	___	___	___(58)
Educational Leave.....	___	___	___	___	___(59)
Other, (Specify): _____...	___	___	___	___	___(60)
_____...	___	___	___	___	___(61)

11. In your opinion, how do the following factors affect your facilities ability to retain qualified personnel?

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY				
	Detracts (1)	Neutral (2)	Aids (3)	Don't Know (9)	
Quality of Services.....	___	___	___	___	___(62)
Caseloads.....	___	___	___	___	___(63)
Salary.....	___	___	___	___	___(64)
Hours in work week.....	___	___	___	___	___(65)
Job Security.....	___	___	___	___	___(66)
Fringe Benefits.....	___	___	___	___	___(67)
Geographic location of Facility	___	___	___	___	___(68)
Physical working conditions....	___	___	___	___	___(69)
Promotional Opportunities.....	___	___	___	___	___(70)
Staff Development Opportunities	___	___	___	___	___(71)
Proximity to Educational Facilities	___	___	___	___	___(72)
Educational Leave.....	___	___	___	___	___(73)
Other, (Specify): _____..	___	___	___	___	___(74)
_____..	___	___	___	___	___(75)

12. What steps have been taken to rectify any staffing problems?

	CHECK ALL THAT APPLY	
No problems.....	___(0)	
No steps taken.....	___(1)	
Increased salaries.....	___(2)	
On-the-job training.....	___(3)	
Time off for college course work.....	___(4)	
Tuition subsidy.....	___(5)	
Educational Leave.....	___(6)	
Other, (Specify): _____..	___(9)	___(76-77)
_____..	___	___(78-80)

PART II

95

For each service PROPOSED in the neighborhood facilities application but NOT provided during April, May, and June, 1971, please supply the following information.

TYPE OF SERVICE PROPOSED	NAMES OF AGENCIES CONTACTED FOR FUNDING (LIST)	TYPE OF AGENCY (CHECK)				HISTORY OF SERVICE (CHECK)				REASON SERVICE IS NOT PROVIDED (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)						DO NOT MARK
	(0-1)	(1) City	(2) County	(3) Private	(9) Other	(1) Provided & Terminated	(2) Planned for Next Quarter	(3) Planned at Later Date	(4) Not planned	(1) No Funds	(2) No Staff	(3) No Equipment	(4) No Need	(5) No Agency Commitment	(9) Other, (Specify)	
	(29)			(30)			(31)						(32)			
Relocation Advice																CARD 3
Rehabilitation Advice																CARD 4
Education																CARD 5
Employment Assistance																CARD 6
Vocational Training																CARD 7
Day Care																CARD 8
Health																CARD 9
Housing/Home Management																CARD 10
Welfare Services																CARD 11
Counseling																CARD 12
Social Services																CARD 13
Consumer Ed. Information																CARD 14
Consumer Aid																CARD 15
Legal Aid																CARD 16
Recreation																CARD 17
Library/Reading Room																CARD 18
Senior Citizen Activity																CARD 19
Other, (Specify):																CARD 20

PART III

For each service PROVIDED in the months Arpil, May, June 1971, please supply the following information.

TYPE OF SERVICE PROVIDED	Name of Operating Agency (LIST)	Type of Agency (CHECK)				Avg. No. of Persons Served Per Week	Ethnicity of Users (Indicate Percentages)						DO NOT MARK
		City	County	Private	Other (Specify)		% White (Non-Minority)	% Spanish American	% Oriental	% Negro/ Black	% American Indian	% Other Minority	
	(29)			(30)		(31-34)	35-36	37-38	39-40	41-42	43-44	45-46	
Relocation Advice													CARD 21
Rehabilitation Advice													CARD 22
Education													CARD 23
Employment Assistance													CARD 24
Vocational Training													CARD 25
Day Care													CARD 26
Health													CARD 27
Housing/Home Management													CARD 28
Welfare Services													CARD 29
Counseling													CARD 30
Social Services													CARD 31
Consumer Ed. Information													CARD 32
Consumer Aid													CARD 33
Recreation													CARD 34
Legal Aid													CARD 35
Library/Reading Room													CARD 36
Senior Citizen Activity													CARD 37
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES:													
Intake													CARD 38
Outreach													CARD 39
Referral													CARD 40
Coordination													CARD 41
Other: (Specify)													CARD 42

PART IV

List all paid individuals who regularly work in the facility. Indicate outstation staff separately in the columns provided. Full-time employment is equal to 35 or more hours per week. Provide all information as of June 30, 1971.

DO NOT MARK

Job Titles	Number of Full-time personnel on payroll 6-30-71	Number of Part-time personnel on payroll 6-30-71	Number of Unfilled full-time authorized 6-30-71	Number of Full-time Outstation* Personnel 6-30-71	Number of Part-time Outstation* Personnel 6-30-71	
	(29-31)	(32-34)	(35-36)	(37-39)	(40-42)	
Director						CARD 43
Deputy Assistant Director						CARD 44
Outreach Workers						CARD 45
Referral Workers						CARD 46
Intake Workers						CARD 47
Community Organizers						CARD 48
Intake Receptionist						CARD 49
Central Records Clerks						CARD 50
Other Clerical						CARD 51
Other Specify:						CARD 52
						CARD 53
TOTAL						CARD 54

*Outstation personnel are those persons who regularly work for the facility and who are paid from sources other than the facility's payroll.

25 52

Neighborhood Facilities Program Survey

COMMENTS

Ques. No.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Appendix B

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES FIELD GUIDE FOR REGIONAL AND AREA OFFICE STAFF

This field guide is to be used for interviewing Regional and Area Office staff, including Assistant Regional Administrators, Human Resources Coordinators, Audit Staff, Housing Management Staff, Area Office Directors and Program Managers, Community Development representatives; HEW and OEO representatives, and other appropriate persons.

A. What is the role for Regional and Area Office in:

   1. Project selection and funding processes and criteria
   2. Monitoring and reporting on NFs
   3. Providing training and technical assistance
   4. Coordinating with other parts/levels of HUD, HEW, OEO, etc.

B. What types or models of centers exist in the Region/ Area?

C. What is the demand for the NF program in terms of number of inquiries, number of applicants, and number in pipeline.

D. What are the problems and issues related to NF?

E. In your opinion, what steps or changes need to be made to make the program more effective?

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES FIELD GUIDE FOR FACILITY SITES

This field guide is to be used for interviewing Neighborhood Facility directors, key staff, heads of agencies, local government officials, and residents using the centers. Data can be gathered by questioning staff and by observing operations.

A. FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS

1. What is the physical location?
2. What is the interior and exterior design?
3. What proportion of the space and equipment in use all day?
4. How close to the center do most users live? (walking distance, on transportation line, etc.)
5. Is the space and equipment sufficient and suitable for the services?

B. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS

1. Is the facility located in the poverty or the non-poverty area of the community?
2. What are the major problems of the neighborhood? (high unemployment, poor housing, discrimination, education, imbalance of age/sex)
3. What is the racial distribution?
4. What is the median income?
5. What is the median educational level?
6. What is the unemployment rate?
7. How many families are on welfare?
8. What is the distinction between the neighborhood and the rest of the city?
9. What are the characteristics of the users of the services? (How much are they the same or different from the neighborhood?)

C. FACILITY HISTORY

1. What was the original purpose for construction?
2. Who were the original sponsors?
3. What were the problems?
4. What has been the history of resident involvement?
5. How long has the facility been operational?

6. What types of program and funding levels were initially envisioned?
7. What changes have occurred in the problems and program focus?
8. What is the present objective for use of the facility?

D. FACILITY STAFFING

1. What is the table of organization?
2. What is the size of the following staff units?
   * Central Administrative
   * Core Services
   * Program Services
   * Board
   * Others
3. What proportion of total staff are from the neighborhood?
4. What proportion of the total staff are men, women, whites, nonwhites?
5. What is the degree of participation of residents on boards and committees?

E. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. Is the information provided on the completed survey questionnaire correct? (If not, correct.)
2. What component programs or services are presently provided? (A component program is a program housed in the facility.)
3. What is the funding pattern for component services including:
   * total funds
   * total federal share
   * percentage and type of local contribution
   * principal sources of the local contribution
   * programs sought but not funded
4. What linked programs exist? (A linked program is a program provided by an agency not housed in the facility which receives referrals from the facility.)
5. How many clients are served by the facility per week? How many are referred to other agencies or programs?

6. What is the process used for:
   * outreach
   * diagnosis
   * referral
   * case management
   * follow-up
   * advocacy
   * community action and organization
   * information dissemination

F. QUALITY OF SERVICES/FACILITY

1. Are the services accessible to the neighborhood? Note transportation hours open, existance of a 24-hour emergency telephone service, and proportion of walk-ins to referrals.
2. Are the workers acceptable, friendly, and courteous?
3. Are the services immediate? Note average wait time, proportion of walk-ins to appointments.
4. Are the services comprehensive and integrated?
5. Are the services responsive to the community wishes and needs?
6. Are the services effective?
7. What changes has the existence of the center made in terms of:
   * agency practices
   * the neighborhood social and economic environment
   * political environment
   * life-styles of the community
   * services provided

G. DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN CONTRACT AND PROVIDED SERVICES

Review with the facility director and local government representative the contract. Probe for reasons behind discrepancies in services proposed in the application and those actually provided.

H. INTERVIEWER CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix C

THE FOLLOWING TABLES A TO Z SUMMARIZE THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF 145 OPERATING FACILITIES

A. Number of Facilities by Length of Time in Operation

Length of Operation	No. of Responses
Less than 6 months	6
Between 6 and 12 months	27
Between 12 and 24 months	48
Between 24 and 36 months	29
Between 36 and 48 months	17
More than 48 months	12
Other Response	2
No Response	4
Total	145

B. Number of Facilities by Grant Applicant

Types of Grant Applicants	No. of Responses
City Mayor's Office	4
City Government/Agency	72
County Government/Agency	13
Housing Authority	5
School Board	3
Private Non-Profit Agency	8
Other Response	9
No Response	31
Total	145

C. Number of Facilities by Types of Owners

Types of Owners	No. of Responses
City Government	96
County Government	15
Private Non-Profit Agency	11
Community Action Program	4
School Board	3
Other Response	14
No Response	2
Total	145

D. Number of Facilities by Types of Operators

Types of Operators	No. of Responses
City Government/Agency	65
County Government/Agency	10
Private Non-Profit Agency	43
Community Action Program	7
School Board	2
City and Private Agencies	2
Other Response	15
No Response	1
Total	145

E. Number of Facilities by Number of Days Open Per Week

Number of Days Open	No. of Responses
0	2
1	3
2-3	1
4-5	52
6-7	87
Total	145

F. NUMBER OF FACILITIES BY NUMBER OF EVENINGS OPEN PER WEEK

Number of Evenings Open	No. of Responses
0	11
1	7
2-3	17
4-5	52
6-7	53
No Response	5
Total	145

G. NUMBER OF FACILITIES BY AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS OPEN PER WEEK

Average No. Hours Open Per Week	No. of Responses
0-20 hours	5
21-40 hours	21
41-60 hours	52
61-80 hours	45
Over 80 hours	20
No Response	2
Total	145

H. Number of Facilities by Time Lag between Date of Approval and Date of Operation

Time Lag in No. of Months	No. of Facilities
Less than 6 months	5
6-12 months	13
12-18 months	39
18-24 months	23
Over 24 months	47
Incomplete Response	18
Total	145

I. Number of Facilities by Amount of Annual Operating Budget

Annual Operating Budget Amounts	No. of Responses
Less than $15,000	25
Between $15,000 and $30,000	27
Between $30,000 and $60,000	18
Between $60,000 and $120,000	25
Over $120,000	18
No Response	32
Total	145

J. NUMBER OF FACILITIES BY AMOUNT OF FEDERAL GRANT FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTION

Federal Grant Amount	No. of Responses
Less than $50,000	4
Between $50,000 and $200,000	67
Between $200,000 and $500,000	48
Between $500,000 and $1,000,000	12
Over $1,000,000	3
No Response	11
Total	145

K. NUMBER OF FACILITIES BY NUMBER OF SERVICES PROVIDED

No. of Services Provided	No. of Responses
Only 1	3
Either 2 or 3	5
Between 4 and 7	37
More than 7	98
No Response	2
Total	145

L. Number of Services Provided by Type

Type of Provided Service	No. of Responses
Recreation	125
Social Services	110
Education	109
Health	106
Counseling	106
Employment Assistance	94
Senior Citizens	88
Welfare Services	83
Housing/Home Management	73
Day Care	67
Library/Reading Room	62
Consumer Education	62
Vocational Training	59
Rehabilitation Advice	57
Legal Aid	45
Relocation Advice	38

M. NUMBER OF SERVICES PROPOSED AND NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SERVICES PROPOSED BUT NOT PROVIDED BY TYPE

Type of Service	Number Proposed	No. Not Provided	% Not Provided
Recreation	144	11	5.8%
Health	120	22	6.5%
Social Services	113	12	5.3%
Education	113	19	1.3%
Counseling	109	17	1.3%
Senior Citizen Activities	106	16	7.6%
Employment Assistance	105	16	5.8%
Day Care	92	26	18.0%
Welfare Services	91	15	6.3%
Library/Reading Room	86	18	8.0%
Vocational Training	73	15	14%
Housing/Home Management	66	16	4.2%
Legal Aid	66	25	24.4%
Consumer Educ.	61	11	10%
Rehab. Advice	60	8	6%
Consumer Aid	30	7	5%
Relocation Advice	30	8	11.1%

N. Number of Additional Services Provided by Type

Type of Service	Number of Additional Services Provided
Civic Activities	37
Housing/Home Management	26
Relocation Advice	18
Counseling	18
Consumer Education	18
Welfare	17
Rehabilitation Advice	15
Education	15
Senior Citizen Activity	15
Consumer Aid	13
Health	11

O. Number of Additional Services Planned by Type

Type of Service	Number of Additional Services Planned
Day Care	29
Vocational Training	27
Senior Citizen Activities	24
Legal Aid	23
Rehabilitation Advice	23
Consumer Education	23
Housing/Home Management	20
Library/Reading Room	19
Education	19
Employment Assistance	18
Consumer Aid	18
Relocation Advice	18
Counseling	15
Social Services	11
Welfare Services	7
Health	6
Recreation	5

P. NUMBER OF PROPOSED SERVICES BUT NOT PROVIDED BY TYPE OF AGENCY CONTACTED FOR FUNDING

Type of Service Proposed	Total Responses	No Known Contact	City Agency	Cty Agency	Private Agency	Multiple Contacts	Other Contacts
Relocation Advice	14	6	1	2	2	3	2
Rehab. Adv.	11	3	2	2	2	4	2
Educ.	19	3	4	4	3	5	2
Employment Assistance	16	1	1	4	1	4	8
Vocational Training	19	4	3	2	2	1	7
Day Care	26	12	5	2	7	6	10
Health	24	3	4	7	5	10	3
Housing/ Home Management	13	2	1	5	1	7	3
Welfare	17	4	2	7	1	5	3
Counseling	16	3	0	4	3	5	5
Social Srv.	12	0	1	4	4	1	2
Consumer Education	12	4	1	2	0	3	4
Consumer Aid	10	5	0	2	2	1	0
Legal Aid	21	2	2	4	5	4	7
Recreation	15	3	5	3	3	3	1
Library/ Reading Rm.	21	5	5	2	3	4	4
Senior Citizens	19	3	6	3	2	0	5
Other Srv.	7	2	1	1	0	0	3

NOTE: Fewer facilities responded to survey items requested for proposed services, thus the responses by type service do not agree with Table M.

Q. NUMBER OF PROPOSED SERVICES BUT NOT PROVIDED BY REASON SERVICE IS NOT PROVIDED

Type of Service Proposed	Total Responses	No Reason Indicated	No Funds	No Staff	No Equip-ment	No Agency Commit-ment	No Need	Other Reason
Relocation Advice	15	5	4	1	0	1	4	0
Rehab Advice	11	5	2	2	0	0	2	0
Education	19	6	4	1	0	4	2	2
Employment Assistance	16	8	4	3	0	1	0	0
Vocational Training	21	6	7	2	2	0	1	3
Day Care	24	8	10	0	0	1	1	4
Health	25	7	5	1	1	6	2	3
Housing/ Home Manage-ment	11	5	3	0	0	0	0	3
Welfare	15	7	4	1	0	2	1	0
Counseling	14	4	3	2	0	4	0	1
Social Service	12	5	3	1	0	1	0	2
Consumer Education	11	3	4	1	0	1	0	2
Consumer Aid	10	2	2	2	0	1	2	1
Legal Aid	20	3	6	2	0	5	0	4
Recreation	14	8	3	1	0	1	0	1
Library/ Reading Rm.	23	8	6	2	0	1	3	3
Senior Citizens	18	6	5	3	0	1	2	1
Other Services	9	1	4	0	0	0	3	1

NOTE: Fewer facilities responded to survey items requested for proposed services, thus the responses by type service do not agree with Table M.

R. NUMBER OF PROPOSED SERVICES BUT NOT PROVIDED BY HISTORY OF SERVICE

Type of Service Proposed	Total Responses & Other	No Response	Planned Later	Not Planned	Provided and Terminated
Relocation Advice	15	7	4	4	0
Rehab Advice	11	3	4	3	1
Education	19	1	11	5	3
Employment Assistance	16	4	8	3	1
Vocational Training	21	0	12	7	2
Day Care	24	3	16	5	1
Health	23	8	12	4	1
Housing/ Home Management	12	5	6	1	1
Welfare	16	4	9	1	1
Counseling	17	3	8	5	0
Social Services	12	3	6	2	0
Consumer Education	13	3	5	1	2
Consumer Aid	10	4	4	3	0
Legal Aid	22	3	12	3	3
Recreation	15	4	8	1	1
Library/ Reading Rm.	23	5	11	7	1
Senior Citizens	20	5	10	3	2
Other Services	8	4	4	0	2

NOTE: Fewer facilities responded to survey items requested for proposed services, thus the responses by type service do not agree with Table M.

S. Number of Provided Services by Type of Agency Delivering Service

Types of Provided Services	Total Response	No Response	City Agency Provides	Cty Agency Provides	Private Agency Provides	Other Agency Provides	Multi-Agency Provides
Relocation Advice	37	6	7	5	7	10	10
Rehab Advice	49	4	7	7	8	19	15
Education	89	11	21	10	19	28	27
Employment Assistance	75	11	6	11	18	32	23
Vocational Training	51	7	7	3	14	22	21
Day Care	66	12	5	11	22	20	21
Health	88	5	11	21	18	23	33
Housing/ Home Management	61	5	6	22	12	15	14
Welfare	72	9	4	23	14	21	20
Counseling	83	9	14	13	18	31	22
Social Services	84	3	12	18	20	32	24
Consumer Education	46	5	4	11	6	17	15
Consumer Aid	27	3	3	3	6	13	8
Recreation	112	10	39	10	30	23	30
Legal Aid	42	3	6	10	9	11	14
Library/ Reading Rm.	47	1	14	8	10	12	11
Senior Citizens	78	8	9	13	17	19	20

NOTE: Few facilities responded to survey items requested for provided services, thus the responses by type of service do not agree with Table L.

T. Number of Services Provided by Number of Persons Served Per Week

Type of Service	Total Response	No Response	Number of Persons Served Per Week: Less than 25	25 to 49	50 to 74	75 to 99	100 to 199	200 to 299	300 or more
Relocation Advice	36	9	25	2	0	1	1	0	0
Rehab Advice	44	8	28	7	0	1	2	1	0
Education	88	16	26	15	5	5	14	3	7
Employment Assistance	77	12	35	16	8	6	2	1	0
Vocational Training	50	9	30	8	3	0	3	0	1
Day Care	67	6	11	21	10	6	8	5	2
Health	87	15	21	26	1	4	10	4	9
Housing/ Home Management	59	14	31	10	3	0	3	0	0
Welfare	71	16	23	14	11	3	4	1	3
Counseling	81	10	31	18	5	5	8	1	5
Social Services	79	16	20	18	7	8	5	3	5
Consumer Education	41	9	20	10	0	4	1	0	0
Consumer Aid	22	4	12	4	1	2	1	0	0
Recreation	105	19	6	9	4	6	12	9	42
Legal Aid	37	10	19	3	1	1	1	8	2
Library/ Reading Rm	45	13	5	8	4	4	6	3	7
Senior Citizens	65	13	18	17	9	4	4	0	1

NOTE: Few facilities responded to survey items requested for provided services, thus the responses by type of service do not agree with Table L.

U. Number of Facilities by Ethnic Group Served

Ethnic Group	Number of Facilities Serving more than 50% of ethnic group
Black	45
White	37
Spanish-American	12
American-Indian	5
Oriental	2
No Ethnic Majority	4
No Response	40
Total	145

V. Number of Facilities by Type of Administrative Service Provided

Type of Administrative Service	Number of Facilities Responding
Referral	56
Coordinative	44
Outreach	42
Intake	39

W. Number of Facilities by Number and Types of Staff

Job Title	Facilities w/Full-time Staff	Facilities w/Part-time Staff	Facilities w/Vacancies	Facilities w/Outstation Staff
Director	99	13	6	22
Deputy Director	44	13	6	3
Outreach Workers	36	12	3	18
Referral Workers	17	5	0	8
Intake Workers	21	4	1	9
Community Organizers	19	8	1	6
Intake Receptionist	37	8	2	10
Central Records Clerks	21	4	0	4
Other Clerical	39	14	1	15
Other Personnel	75	50	8	32

X. Number of Factors which Detract and Aid in Recruiting Staff

Recruitment Factors	Detracts	Neutral	Aids	Don't Know
Quality of Services	4	31	66	8
Caseloads	7	41	18	30
Salary	41	29	34	6
Hours in Work Week	19	46	21	11
Job Security	21	37	40	10
Fringe Benefits	14	32	48	13
Geographic Location of Facility	12	29	41	14
Physical Working Conditions	9	27	52	10
Promotional Opportunities	25	44	24	12
Staff Development Opportunities	9	35	32	12
Proximity to Educational Facilities	6	33	36	13
Educational Leave	5	35	18	26
Other Factors	3	2	5	1

Y. Number of Factors which Detract and Aid in Retaining Staff

Retention Factors	Detracts	Neutral	Aids	Don't Know
Quality of Services	3	24	73	9
Caseloads	14	45	25	13
Salary	39	24	34	11
Hours in Work Week	21	40	39	10
Job Security	24	31	42	14
Fringe Benefits	14	34	53	6
Georgraphic Location of Facility	11	33	55	10
Physical Working Conditions	7	24	73	5
Promotional Opportunities	22	39	32	10
Staff Development Opportunities	12	30	51	11
Proximity to Educational Facilities	5	38	44	18
Educational Leave	9	32	35	23
Other Factors	3	3	5	2

Z. Number of Facility Responses to Steps Taken to Rectify Staffing Problems

Steps Taken to Rectify Staffing Problems	Number of Responses
No Problems	38
No Steps Taken	17
Increased Salaries	7
On-the Job Training	10
Time off for Courses	3
Tuition	1
Educational Leave	0
Multiple Steps	43
Other Steps	13
No Response	13
Total	145

GPO 931-632